DAN BURTON, INDIANA, CHAIRMAN

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, NEW YORK
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA. MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, CONNECTICUT
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, FLORIDA
JOHN M. MCHUGH, NEW YORK
STEPHEN HORN, CALIFORNIA
JOHN M. MCHUGH, NEW YORK
STEPHEN HORN, CALIFORNIA
JOHN I. MICA, FLORIDA
THOMAS M. DAVIS III, VIRGINIA
DAVID M. MGINTOSH, INDIANA
MARK E. SOUDER, INDIANA
JOE SCARBOROUGH, FLORIDA
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, OHIO
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, SOUTH CAROLINA
BOB BARR, GEORGIA
DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
ASA HUTCHINSON, ARKANSAS
LEE TERRY, NEBRASKA
JUDY BIGGERT, ILLINOIS
GREG WALDEN, OREGON
DOUG OSE, CALIFORNIA
PAUL RYAN, WISCONSIN
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, CALIFORNIA
HELEN CHENOWETH, IDAHO

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM 2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

> MAJORITY (202) 225–5074 MINORITY (202) 225–5051 TTV (202) 225–6852

June 4, 1999

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

TOM LANTOS. CALIFORNIA
ROBERT E. WISE, JIR., WEST VIRGINIA
MAJOR R. OWENS. NEW YORK
EDOLPHUS TOWNS. NEW YORK
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, PENNSYLVANIA
PATSY T. MINK, HAWAII
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NEW YORK
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHAKA FATTAH, PENNSYLVANIA
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, OHIO
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, ILLINOIS
JOHN F. TIERNEY, MASSACHUSETTS
JIM TURNER, TEXAS
THOMAS H. ALLEN, MAINE
HAROLD E. FORD, JIR., TENNESSEE
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, ILLINOIS

BERNARD SANDERS, VERMONT, INDEPENDENT

The Honorable Janice Lachance Director U.S. Office of Personnel Management 1900 E Street, N.W.

Dear Director Lachance:

Washington, D.C. 20415

It has been brought to the Committee's attention that OPM may soon issue a regulation detailing requirements for the Military Retirees' FEHB Coverage Demonstration Project ("demonstration project"). The Committee is particularly concerned with matters that have been brought to our attention concerning OPM's plans for implementing the statutory requirement of a separate risk pool for military beneficiaries.

Our understanding is that OPM is considering two options. The first is to require carriers to create a separate reserve for military retirees participating in the program. Under the second alternative, OPM would use the unused portion of administrative reserves to cushion any losses incurred by carriers in the demonstration project, but not necessarily in proportion to the carriers' total premiums for a year. We believe that neither of these alternatives is consistent with law.

Clearly, the proposal to require carriers to maintain separate reserves is not consistent with the law establishing the demonstration project. The statute states that OPM, "shall require health benefits plans under chapter 89 of title 5 that participate in the demonstration project to maintain a separate risk pool for purposes of establishing premium rates for eligible beneficiaries who enroll in such a plan in accordance with this section." 10 U.S.C. § 1108(h)(1) (emphasis added). Were OPM to require a separate reserve for military retirees, they would effectively not be participating in FEHB, nor receiving the benefits of such participation.

The purpose of the demonstration project is to determine whether the long term participation of military retirees is feasible. To do so, military retirees must be able to participate under the same circumstances as other enrollees. The statutory language and intent is very clear that a separate risk pool is required only for the purposes of establishing premium rates and not for establishing separate reserves. We view this

statutory language as analogous to the current manner in which separate risk pools for purposes of establishing premium rates are maintained for self-only and self-and-family enrollments without requiring separate reserves for each category.

Likewise, we do not believe that OPM may legally use the administrative reserve as a general reserve fund available without limitation to any carrier who suffers a loss in the demonstration project. If administrative reserves that are not used to defray OPM's own expenses are to be distributed, they must be allocated to the contingency reserves of the various carriers in accordance with section 8909(b) of title 5. That statute requires such unused funds to be credited to the carriers based upon their relative premium income for the year.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dan Burton

Chairman

Joe Scarborough

Chairman, Subcommittee on

Civil Service